ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT		
DRAFT - Meeting Minutes of March 15, 2011		
ATTENDEES:	Doug Kirkwood - Chairman, Carl Miller, Jamie Ramsay, Joe Taggart, and Charlie Tiedemann – Planning Director	
The meeting opene process.	ed at 7:00 p.m., Doug Kirkwood made introductions and explained the	
Greenwood Road provisions of the A Zone, subsec. 4.3 construct a freesta feet required) and	CASE 1457: LOT 24-65 GREENWOOD ROAD: Variances – Diane Zsofka, 27 Greenwood Road, Amherst NH 03031 (owner), requests Variances from the provisions of the Amherst Zoning Ordinance Art. IV, Sec. 4.3 Residential / Rural Zone, subsec. 4.3.3 Yard Requirements, Para. 4.3.3.3 in order that they may construct a freestanding shed that will be 14.6 feet from the side property line (20 Greet required) and 35.7 feet from the street line (50 feet required). Residential / Rural Zone (Watershed Protection District and Flood Plain Conservation District Overlays)	
where the detached the site in a nook b encroachment. The house to store person	chael representing the applicant presented the plan; which indicates I shed is proposed and provided profiles and elevations, that showed etween the house and the septic system. This would not increase applicant would like to build the shed to look integrated with the onal items and equipment. The septic is located the farthest point from randfathered lot of record. It is an existing structure that has been years.	
residential envelop exists. Spirit of Or embrace all the difficence of the older are between lots. The not alter the charace public rights are aff substantial justice of style. The applicant and they do not see relationship with the	ntrary to public interest; the shed location is within the existing e on the site and creates no greater encroachment than what currently dinance – the Ordinance has setbacks but the Ordinance does not ferent lots and parcels that exist within the Town. Baboosic Lake is eas of development in Town. The setback was to create separation people living near the lake try to adhere to the Ordinances. This does ter of the neighborhood nor threaten the public safety or welfare. No fected; substantial justice – this would not benefit the pubic but would allow this to occur. The shed would be integrated into the house its do not wish to make the house look bad but they want it to be right any dimunision of values. This will not affect the fair and substantial the neighborhood. The lot makes it difficult to move the house; it is reasonable. Attorney Michael finished the presentation and has bints. This would allow reasonable expansion.	
septic tank. Attorn Tiedemann noted t	ked about the edge of the shed being slightly over the edge of the ley Michael believes it is just what it is on the plan. Charlie he manholes to get in the tank are exposed. The shed can be moved if o the septic tank. Attorney Michael said the shed will not be affixed to	

- the house and could be moved. Jamie Ramsay asked why it is proposed as detached as opposed to attached? Attorney Michael could not answer the question, it looks like it is
- 49 attached but it is actually detached. There were no further questions.

50

Doug Kirkwood noted that there is not a full complement of the board here tonight and if Attorney Michael does not wish to continue we will not. Attorney Michael wished to continue.

54

DELIBERATIONS:

555657

Jamie Ramsay moved to enter deliberations. Carl Miller seconded. All were in favor.

58

Carl Miller moved there is no regional impact. Jamie Ramsay seconded. All were infavor.

61 62

II. Conclusions [RSA 674:33, I (b)]:

63

- 1. The Variance will not be contrary to the public interest.
- Carl Miller true, most people would not even notice this; Joe Taggart true; Jamie Ramsey true the shed will be integrated with the house pretty well; Doug Kirkwood true.
- 67 True: 4, Not True: 0

68 69

- 2. The Variance is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.
- Joe Taggart true, this will not impact the side lot and does not encroach the front any more than the carport; Jamie Ramsay true this will not affect the health safety or welfare of the public; Doug Kirkwood true, noting this is a grandfathered lot, the nonconforming use is not expanded; Carl Miller true
- 74 True: 4, Not True: 0

75 76

- 3. Substantial justice is done.
- Jamie Ramsay true the applicant can enjoy their property to store equipment; Carl Miller true; Joe Taggart true and the neighbors will no longer need to see the equipment, Doug Kirkwood true
- 80 True: 4, Not True: 0

81

- 82 4. The values of surrounding properties will not be diminished.
- Carl Miller true, this should not affect the value of the property; Jamie Ramsay true it does not change the scale of the property; Joe Taggart true and it may be a benefit to
- abutters since they will no longer see equipment; Doug Kirkwood true
- 86 True: 4, Not True: 0

87

- 5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship.
 - (Apply tests under A or B below)

90 91

- A. For purposes of this subparagraph, "unnecessary hardship" means that, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area:
 - (1) No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the Ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property; and

99 (2) The proposed use is a reasonable one.

Jamie Ramsay true; this is an excellent example that the shed could not be built anywhere without some encroachment on the side lots and there is no enclosed garage and it is a reasonable use to have an enclosed storage area for equipment; Jamie Ramsay true, Carl Miller true, Doug Kirkwood true

True: 4, Not True: 0

B. If the criteria in subparagraph A are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably used in strict conformance with the Ordinance, and a Variance is therefore necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

This application has passed all the tests therefore the Chairman declared that the Variance is granted.

OLD BUSINESS:

Doug Kirkwood asked Attorney Michael about the reviewing of tests. Attorney Michael said each community performs the tests differently. Doug Kirkwood said if an applicant passes the five tests, how can the ZBA can say no.

121 Carl Miller moved to come out of deliberations at 7:25 p.m. Jamie Ramsey seconded. 122 All were in favor.

Minutes 2/15/11

Doug Kirkwood noted the majority of those present at the February meeting are present.

Jamie Ramsay moved to approve the minutes of 2/15/11. Carl Miller seconded.

- Discussion: Doug Kirkwood asked if the Draft watermark is shown on the internet.
- 131 Charlie Tiedemann does not believe it is visible until it is printed, so he will have to come up with a different manner of noting that the minutes are Draft.

134 All were in favor of the motion.

136 Minutes 11/16/10

138 Because there was no meeting in December and the January meeting was snowed out, 139 then the February meeting was so long the minutes were not reviewed, so here are the 140 November minutes. Charlie Tiedemann briefly reviewed the topics of that meeting. 141 142 Carl Miller and Joe Taggart reviewed the draft minutes on the internet; Charlie 143 Tiedemann noted if the Board would like to wait and review them next month that would 144 be fine. Doug Kirkwood asked that Charlie Tiedemann remind members to review and 145 send another copy for review for the next meeting. 146 147 Jamie Ramsay welcomed Joe Taggart as a new member. Doug Kirkwood said there were 148 a lot of interesting votes. Charlie Tiedemann also noted there were six absentee ballots 149 received the day after voting. 150 151 Carl Miller moved to adjourn at 7:50 p.m. Joe Taggart seconded. All were in favor. 152 153 The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m. 154 155 Respectfully submitted, 156 157 158 Darlene J. Bouffard 159 Recording Secretary 160 161